

Appl. No.: 10/796,752  
Amdt. Dated: April 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of: October 6, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 10 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claims 11 – 21 have been withdrawn as a result of an earlier restriction requirement. In view of the examiner's earlier restriction requirement, Applicants retain the right to present claims 11 – 21 in a divisional application. New claims 22 – 33 have been added.

Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out an earlier duplication of claim numbers, and have indicated the change in the preceding listing of claims.

#### **1. Specification**

The specification (Paragraph [0038]) has been amended to include reference to the circle in FIG. 3a as depicting the region illustrated in FIG. 3b and showing the seal over the electrode 304.

Applicants believe the amendment to paragraph [0038] does not add new material, but merely explains the presence of the circle of FIG. 3a indicating that it references the area or region depicted in FIG. 3b.

#### **2. Drawings**

Amended drawings have been included herewith. FIG. 2 has been amended to include a lead line from reference numeral 205, indicating substrate 205. Paragraphs 0030 and 0033, among others, clearly describe reference numeral 205 as the glass substrate to which laser 202 directs a beam.

Also, a reference numeral 200 has been added to FIG. 2. Paragraph 0029 clearly denotes reference numeral 200 as representing the apparatus of FIG. 2.

#### **3. § 112 Rejections**

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 as lacking antecedent basis for the limitation "OLED".

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection. Claim 10 reads, in substantive part, "...wherein an OLED material is between...". The term "OLED" is preceded by the indefinite article "an". Thus OLED does not require an antecedent basis.

Appl. No.: 10/796,752  
Amdt. Dated: April 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of: October 6, 2006

Applicants assert that the rejection is improper and request that the Examiner withdraw the § 112 rejection.

#### 4. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over Fukazawa et al. (US Patent No. 6,136,622).

The Examiner contends that Fukazawa et al. disclose an organic EL device wherein, inter alia, laser light is used to affix the sealing glass cap on the device, and that the laser light fuses the device.

Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection.

Fukazawa et al. teach a method of performing laser ablation, not sealing a top and bottom substrate one to another. Fukazawa et al. teach only that the sealing glass cap is adhered or bonded to the glass substrate without disclosing how. See for example column 3, lines 38 – 43; column 4, lines 7 – 9, and; column 5, lines 19 – 20. Moreover, only subsequent to the sealing is a laser is used, and then to "...fuse the second electrode and the titanium layer to divide these layers into two adjacent and mutually isolated layers." (column 3, lines 38 – 43). Applicants therefore assert that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of anticipation, and that claim 1 is patentable over Fukazawa et al.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to fix certain antecedent basis issues.

#### 5. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Li et al. (US Patent No. 2003/0066311) in view of Fukazawa et al.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestion with respect to common inventorship, but wish to point out that co-inventor Xinghua Li of the present application is not Chien-Hsing Li of US Patent No. 2003/0066311, and therefore common inventorship does not exist.

Nevertheless, for at least the reasons given above, Fukazawa et al. do not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention. In particular, Fukazawa et al. do not disclose using a laser to seal substrates, let alone sealing by focusing a high power, pulsed laser onto a region of the substrate, thereby causing the substrates to be sealed, and Li et al. do not cure this deficiency. Applicants contend that the Examiner has failed to make a prima

Appl. No.: 10/796,752  
Amdt. Dated: April 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of: October 6, 2006

facie case of obviousness, and that pending claims 1 – 10 are patentable over the prior art of record.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Morena et al. (US Patent No. 2004/0206953) in view of Fukazawa et al.

In particular, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a fast, powerful laser as taught by Fukazawa et al. in practicing Morena et al. because this use would minimize structural changes throughout the device.

Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection.

Morena et al. teach the need for a dopant (e.g. a transition metal dopant) to enhance the absorption of the sealing glass plate (or fiber). Hence, a continuous wave laser is suitable for accomplishing the sealing process (see for example, Experiment #1). Applicant's invention relies upon a sealing medium which, under ordinary conditions (e.g. a low power, continuous wave laser), is transparent to the wavelength of laser light. However, under conditions taught by Applicants, non-linear absorption occurs in the otherwise transparent top substrate, causing the substrate to swell and form a hermetic seal with the bottom substrate.

It is not clear what structural changes the Examiner is referring to with respect to Morena, et al., or how Applicants' invention would overcome such structural changes.

In any event, for at least the reasons given above, Fukazawa et al. do not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention. Moreover, Fukazawa et al. do not teach a method of sealing substrates. Morena et al. do not cure this deficiency. Applicants contend that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness, and that pending claims 1 – 10 are patentable over the prior art of record.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Auch et al. (US Patent No. 6,803,245) in view of Fukazawa et al.

Again, the Examiner points out that applying Auch to Fukazawa would minimize structural changes throughout the device. It is not clear what structural changes the Examiner is referring to, or how Applicants' invention would overcome such structural changes.

In any event, for at least the reasons given above, Fukazawa et al. do not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention. Auch et al. do not cure this deficiency. Applicants contend that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness, and that pending claims 1 – 10 are patentable over the prior art of record.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Liu et al. (US Patent No. 6,608,283) in view of Fukazawa et al.

Appl. No.: 10/796,752  
Amdt. Dated: April 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of: October 6, 2006

It is not clear what structural changes the Examiner is referring to, or how Applicants' invention would overcome such structural changes.

Nevertheless, for at least the reasons given above, Fukazawa et al. do not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention and Liu et al. do not cure this deficiency. Applicants contend that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness, and that pending claims 1 – 10 are patentable over the prior art of record.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Langer et al. (US Patent No. 6,936,963) in view of Fukazawa et al.

It is not clear what structural changes the Examiner is referring to, or how Applicants' invention would overcome such structural changes, and thus why it would be obvious to combine the references. However, for at least the reasons given above, Fukazawa et al. do not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention, and Langer et al. do not cure this deficiency. Applicants contend that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness, and that pending claims 1 – 10 are patentable over the prior art of record.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Fleming et al. (US Patent No. 6,111,357) in view of Fukazawa et al.

It is not clear what structural changes throughout the device the Examiner is referring to, or how Applicants' invention would overcome such structural changes, and thus why it would be obvious to combine the references. However, for at least the reasons given above, Fukazawa et al. do not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention, and Fleming et al. do not cure this deficiency. Applicants contend that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness, and that pending claims 1 – 10 are patentable over the prior art of record.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Guenther et al. (US Patent No. 6,952,078) in view of Fukazawa et al.

It is not clear what structural changes the Examiner is referring to, or how Applicants' invention would overcome such structural changes, and thus why it would be obvious to combine the references. However, for at least the reasons given above, Fukazawa et al. do not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claimed invention, and Guenther et al. do not cure this deficiency. Applicants contend that the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness, and that pending claims 1 – 10 are patentable over the prior art of record.

Appl. No.: 10/796,752  
Amdt. Dated: April 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of: October 6, 2006

#### 6. Conclusion

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, Applicants believe the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants believe a three month extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely. Applicants respectfully request that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorize the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Kevin M. Able at 607-974-2637.

April 3, 2007  
Date

<b>CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION</b> <b>UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8</b>	
I hereby certify that this paper and any papers referred to herein are being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at 571-273-8300 on:	
<u>April 3, 2007</u> Date	
<u>Kevin M. Able</u> Kevin M. Able	<u>4/3/07</u> Date

Respectfully submitted,  
CORNING INCORPORATED

Kevin M. Able  
Kevin M. Able  
Registration No. 52,401  
Corning Incorporated  
Patent Department  
Mail Stop SP-TT-03-1  
Corning, NY 14831